

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action dated March 30, 2011 (hereinafter, "Office Action"), claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claims 4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). By this paper, claims 1-2, 6-10, 13 and 15-20 are being amended.

Applicant respectfully responds to the Office Action.

I. Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-20 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,647,402 to McBrearty et al. (hereinafter, "McBrearty"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP § 2131 (citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." Id. (citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). In addition, "the reference must be enabling and describe the applicant's claimed invention sufficiently to have placed it in possession of a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." In re Paulsen, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "preventing access to all of the sensitive files identified by the sensitive file information by performing an access prevention task ..., wherein the sensitive files continue to be stored on the computing device but all of the sensitive files cannot be accessed when access is being prevented." Support for this claimed subject matter is found in paragraphs [0047]-[0048] and [0053]-[0054] of the filed specification.

McBrearty discloses "a system, method and program for protecting data files from being stolen or compromised." (McBrearty, col. 2, lines 46-48.) Specifically, "[w]hen a user requests a file ... a determination is made ... as to whether the user is authenticated, i.e. his ID matches the ID of [an] authorized user," and "[i]f Yes, the user is granted access to the requested file" and "[i]f No, then the user is refused access to the file." (McBrearty, col. 5, lines 58-63.) If there are repeated

failures at authorization for the specific file, the system determines that there is a potential intruder trying to access the file. (See McBrearty, col. 4, lines 35-43.) Other ways for determining that a hacker is trying to access the file may also be used. (See McBrearty, col. 6, lines 4-7.) After this potential intrusion is determined, the “target file is renamed” with a name that does not give “information about the contents of the file,” and the “whole file is then moved ... to another hidden or covert directory.” (McBrearty, col. 6, lines 10-16.) “In this manner, the hacker attacking the files is still continuing to look for the original file which has been renamed, hidden in a different directory and, thus, protected.” (McBrearty, col. 4, lines 49-51.)

Although McBrearty teaches that a “target file is renamed” and “moved ... to another hidden or covert directory,” McBrearty’s system is addressing a method of preventing the hacker from gaining access to the particular (individual) target file under attack. There is no indication that there is a collection of “multiple sensitive files” that will be renamed and moved in the event of a hacker attack. In other words, the “access prevention task” being performed by McBrearty (i.e., renaming the file and moving the file to a secure location) secures only the particular file under attack, but does not secure “multiple sensitive files” that are identified by “sensitive file information.” McBrearty is simply silent regarding a method for securing sensitive files other than the file being attacked by the hacker. Thus, McBrearty does not disclose “preventing access to all of the sensitive files identified by the sensitive file information by performing an access prevention task,” as recited by amended claim 1. Further, there is also no suggestion in McBrearty that “all of the sensitive files [stored on the computer system] cannot be accessed when access is being prevented,” as required by amended claim 1. Accordingly, McBrearty does not disclose the subject matter of amended claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-3, 5-6 and 8-12 depend from claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 13 recites a security agent that is configured to “prevent access to all of the sensitive files identified by the sensitive file information by performing an access prevention task ..., wherein the sensitive files continue to be stored on the computing device but all of the sensitive files cannot be accessed when access is being prevented.” As discussed above, McBrearty does not disclose this

claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 13 is allowable. Claim 14 depends from claim 13 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 13.

Claim 15 recites instructions executable to “prevent access to all of the sensitive files identified by the sensitive file information by performing an access prevention task ..., wherein the sensitive files continue to be stored on the computing device but all of the sensitive files cannot be accessed when access is being prevented.” As discussed above, McBrearty does not disclose this claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 15 is allowable. Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

Claim 18 recites instructions executable to “prevent access to all of the sensitive files identified by the sensitive file information by performing an access prevention task ..., wherein the sensitive files continue to be stored on the computing device but all of the sensitive files cannot be accessed when access is being prevented.” As discussed above, McBrearty does not disclose this claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 18 is allowable. Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

II. Claim 4 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on McBrearty and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0056095 to Elliott et al. (hereinafter, “Elliott”). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is allowable for at least the same reasons as presented above in connection with claim 1.

III. Claim 7 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on McBrearty and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,265,159 to Kung (hereinafter, "Kung"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is allowable for at least the same reasons as presented above in connection with claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims in the present application are in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Wesley L. Austin/

Wesley L. Austin
Reg. No. 42,273
Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 29, 2011

AUSTIN RAPP & HARDMAN
170 South Main Street, Suite 735
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: (801) 537-1700